

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, MARCH 19, 1910

No. 20

Readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, who so often hear the criticism of the work in Prose Composition, may be interested in reading the following piece of writing. The author, a senior in a High School, had been reading a cowboy story in the school paper during study period, and had been told to report the story in Latin. Here is his report, just as he handed it in:

SMITHUS TORTUS CRINEM.

Jacobus Smithus pastor in Bar S pastorali agro fiebat. Peritissimus huius operis mox erat. Proximo mense Smithusque reliqui (sic) pastores exierunt ut pecus cogere. Illis profectis, graviter ningere coepit. Manus desertam domum petivit. Hic Cal dux narravit se a homine (sic) Lasalle cognomine fere falsum esse. Ea re audita, Smithus commotus, equo ascenso, caeruleam domum Lasallis per magnam nivem perque severum frigus petivit. Hic postquam diu et acriter pugnatum est, Smithus Lasallem interfecit.

Some notes may be in place: *tortus crinem* = 'curly'; *pastorali agro* = 'ranch'; *pecus cogere* = 'round up'; *caeruleam domum* = 'the dark green house'. It may perhaps be doubted that the work was done independently. This, however, is the fact, the only help used being an English-Latin dictionary for the word *ningere*.

But aside from the fun to be had from this clever piece of work, it arouses some serious reflections. The wretched results of our instruction in prose work are but too well known, and are at the present time made the subject of an inquiry. I am not now concerned in discussing methods of teaching, but I wish to ask our readers, and the authorities who write text books on composition and examination papers, whether it might not be worth while to try to break away from the usual rehash of phrases and clauses, and give our students some real mental pabulum, which might contribute toward a realization of the fact that the Romans were actually living beings with feelings and desires like our own. I know I am not the only one who has that secret thought. A recent text book on prose composition for College Freshmen makes the attempt, defective as it may be, to infuse life into its exercises. When I was teaching Greek—aurea illa Saturni aetate—I used to assign to my Homer class a chapter in Xenophon for review, and then send the boys to the blackboard, dictating to them a modern story, say about mountain climbing or the like, based on the vocabulary of the chapter studied. While the

results, at first, were largely comical, the boys soon took to the idea with great pleasure, and became really quite proficient in thus expressing ideas of their own life in the ancient form. At present, I am engaged in a similar attempt with a seventh term class. After the regular prose lesson has been done, we close books, and I give the boys, orally, a simplified biography of Vergil, which they render into Latin, sentence by sentence. We make up our vocabulary, most frequently, by reference to the works of Caesar and Cicero, which I quote to them and lead them to form their phrases from these. While the boys at first were very timid about coming forward, they have now come to like the idea very much, and I hope to continue the work with them in their last term in a more extended fashion. I do not want to be misunderstood: this is no mere clown's work, an artificial stimulant of interest. Each sentence has been carefully thought out to contain some syntactical principle. I confess that I have been inspired to undertake the work by remembering my own boyhood. Our copy books in penmanship, even, contained information, moral and mental, and among my most treasured recollections from the Gymnasium are those hours in the upper forms, when we struggled with newspaper articles on timely topics, which were assigned to us as prose tests. Of course, the work in this country will have to be much more simple, but I am convinced that it can be done, and will contribute its mite toward kindling a flame of love for the Classics, which now is so sadly smothered under the farrago of inane verbiage. If these lines shall excite a discussion in the columns of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, I shall be more than pleased, and am quite willing to take a sound drubbing if I can be proven to be in the wrong.

E. R.

HALFIGHTS IN ANCIENT LITERATURE

HERMAGORAS

We American classicists have not, as yet, done much towards the elucidation of problems connected with ancient rhetoric. Our instructors in declamation and rhetoric are as a rule innocent of Aristotle. Our productive classicists too, in the main, follow the groove of college reading and let Cicero alone. Writers on Ancient Art, too, trained archaeologists though they often be, know not that

the abundant allusions to the parallels of art and literary style were evolved in the rhetorical schools and so are found in Aristotle, Theophrastus, Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian—an academic tradition of the rhetorical schools.

In the history of ancient rhetoric a conspicuous position was gained by Hermagoras of Temnos. I have taken him up for a paper because, in a searching study of Cicero's rhetorical treatises, I have discovered considerable confusion as to Hermagoras's work and time; in fact, I believe that even Otto Jahn and W. Christ (Griech. Literaturgeschichte³, 750) and the editors of Cicero's Brutus generally, have been led into error by certain mistakes in their interpretation of the extant data of classic tradition. Westermann too, seems to have been confused, as was R. Volkmann. Utterly confused too is the article Hermagoras in Orelli's Onomasticon Tullianum. Compare also the short article by B. in the Old Pauly. Pauly-Wissowa has not yet reached this word. In the Suidas articles *our* Hermagoras is fused with Hermagoras Karion, who taught rhetoric and style in Rome with Caecilius of Cale Akte, friend of Dionysius, in the reign of Augustus, and lived to great age.

Blass, in his noted monograph of 1865, (p. 278), divides the entire history of the development of Greek rhetorical *τέχνη* into three periods or movements, thus: The Pre-Aristotelian, from Gorgias to Isocrates; 2) the Aristotelian, brusquely opposed to the Isocratean School; 3) "The third kind (Gattung) was established in the second century by Hermagoras of Temnos; its characteristic element is the barren subtlety on account of which Spengel has very aptly called it the *scholastic* (kind); it prevailed down to the end of classical antiquity and of Greek literature". The chief point of eminence in the historical place of Hermagoras however, must not be belittled before it is at all understood or perceived afar off. Even in St. Augustine's *τέχνη* and in Isidorus we still find it as essential and important. In fact it seems that the former, as teacher of rhetoric, in his pre-Christian period, in Africa, Rome and Milan, cited Hermagoras, often using the technical terms in the original Greek; probably before 387.

The contribution of Hermagoras to ancient rhetoric is this: he devised certain categories of position (*ordais*), to some of which every case of the pleader's experiences may or rather *must* be assigned. The doctrine of *status* then became so obstinately important, because it furnished, as it were, a practical and useful bridge from the theory of the schools to the practice of the courts. It classified the possible points at issue between prosecution and defense (*τὸ κριθήμενον*) I do not, of course, intend here to rewrite any chapter of Volk-

mann. There is no reason for doubting that young Cicero in his *torso* (De Inventione) book 2 presents in the main a Latinization of the *τέχνη* of his Greek rhetor or rhetors (he heard no others).

Just *when* in the Cinna period of Roman annals young Cicero put forward this book, even after Marx on Cornificius (I have no hesitation on the score of the name), will remain somewhat undefinable.

In the introduction to Book II indeed young Cicero somewhat boastfully tries to create the impression that he has had not *one* source, but like Zeuxis (when he painted his Helena for the people of Croton), has brought together his excellences from many books. He had indeed before him or near him Aristotle's *Συμπεφυκή τεχνῶν*. This seems to explain his somewhat specious phrase of the many *τέχναι*.

The parallels with Cornificius point to a single source. In fact Quintilian's references (3. 6. 59, etc.) to the youthful work of Cicero are familiar: They are reprinted in all the manuals. But to go on: As for the maturer Cicero, with his outward disdain of mere *τέχνη* he still returns to *status* again and again, e. g. De Orat. 1. 139-140; 2. 104 ff., 132 ff.; Orator 45, 121; Partitiones 34, 41, 42; Topica 50, 51, 87, 92, 93. Cicero also delineates a theory of *status* for *deliberatio* and *laudatio*. Unfortunately Cicero had not consulted Volkmann.

In his own maturity and power Cicero referred but twice more to Hermagoras by name: 1) in Brutus 263 (when Cicero was sixty years of age); C. Licinius...quaestorius mortuus est; probabilis orator, iam vero etiam *probatas ex hac* (now present and everywhere prevailing) *inopi ad ornandum, sed ad inveniendum expedita Hermagorae disciplina*. Ea dat rationes certas et praecepta dicendi; quae, si minorem habent apparatus (sunt enim exilia) tamen habent ordinem et quasdam errari in dicendo non patientes vias.

The other reference is Brutus 271. Speaking of T. Accius of Pisaurum (his opponent in the Cluentius case) he says: Qui et accurate dicebat et satis copiose eratque praeterea *doctus Hermagorae praeceptis*. He does not say a *Hermagora doctus*. Even as a young man Cicero could acquire this doctrine of *status*, without abstaining from criticism in other respects. The freedom of censure and the rather scanty measure of praise (Cic. Invent. 1. 8) seem to make it more probable that Cicero is referring to one who is dead, whereas his manual, his *ars*, is currently used everywhere.

But in 62 B. C. when Pompey returned from the Mithridatic and other eastern wars, he stopped over at Rhodes: he had been out of the senate and away from the capital full five years, for he had not returned to Rome after the pirate war of 67. At Rhodes then Pompey heard lectures from old

Posidonius on rhetoric. I cite from Plut. Pomp. 42; 'In Rhodes Pompey heard all the scholars and gave each one a present of a talent; but Posidonius even composed or wrote out the lecture which he held before him, having prepared it in reply to *Hermagoras*, about the principles of rhetoric in general'. This πρὸς Ἑρμαγόραν of Plutarch's text has deceived the editors of Cicero's Brutus and many others. One can hold a lecture in reply to, or in rejoinder to or for subversal of the current doctrine or theory of the most eminent representative of a widely prevailing system, without having that authority present in the flesh, or even alive. But this Jahn and the others overlooked and thus created impossibilities. There was a theory of *status* everywhere, but it seems the *τεχνογράφοι* not always accepted the classification of Hermagoras. In Quintil. 3. 6. 31 ff. Some put two, as did Apollodorus (who taught Octavianus); so also Theodorus though with a radically different theory. And then Posidonius himself is named, who had also two large classes of *στάσεις*.

But this will do to clear the matter.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

E. G. SIHLER.

LITERATURE VERSUS PHILOLOGY

For some time in public discussion and private conversation a wordy war has been waged between the partisans of Literature on the one side and the partisans of Philology on the other, while those who have not felt called upon to take either side have stood apart and watched the fray, either as spectators interested in the outcome, or as mere lovers of a good fight. As is usual in wars many of the warriors in either camp do not understand what the fight is all about, but having taken sides, they are doing their best to put their antagonists out of business. It is the leaders—and by these we mean those who have written on the subject for publication—who are stirring up all the disturbance. Yet even in their case one cannot help feeling that some of them are as bewildered in respect of the real point at issue as are many of the rank and file.

The leaders on the side of literature say that their opponents, whom they stigmatize as 'narrow philologists' and 'gerund-grinders', do not teach literature in such a way as to ennoble and enrich the minds of their pupils, but give them the dry husks of a dead and deadening study of the dry bones of an inanimate skeleton, while the 'narrow philologist', thus rudely awakened from his intensive study of this 'subject' which we call language, is beginning to fight in self-defense, at the same time casting about in his mind for good and valid arguments by using which as a club he may pound some sense into the heads of his adversaries.

In this, as in every question debatable with arguments or fists, there are two sides, and if we can

call a halt in the conflict we may be able to show to all concerned that they really agree in all essentials as well as in most of the details.

Literature—in the dictionaries there are many definitions—is that which is written in the noblest language and gives enlightenment and pleasure in their noblest forms. No one, not even the philologist, will for a moment deny that the study of literature, as thus defined, will be of exceeding value to the student. Yet, in spite of the fact that there are high-school pupils who 'understand Shakespeare perfectly', it is true that literature cannot be understood, or even enjoyed, until the mind of the pupil has been educated by easy, not *too* easy, stages to the point where it can feel the thrill of pleasure which comes from association with the best minds through the medium of the best literature.

Now everyone thinks that he understands his mother-tongue; some are even conceited enough to say that they understand two or more languages, but when a test is made the subject is brought to see that he did not know what it was 'to understand'. Hence the need for English, Course A, and Rhetoric, Course B, as well as for courses in other languages; hence the need for the intensive study of mere words that the student may be sure that from the possible meanings he can choose the one which will fit in any given case. A *brown* hat is something we have all seen, but what does Dante mean when he says, 'e l'aer *bruno* toglieva gli animi'? One might make a guess and pass on—to other guesses, but if he does he will not understand the poet. The answer to this might be that the teacher's duty is to make such explanation as is necessary to insure clear understanding on the part of the pupil. 'No', answers the philologist, 'for how does the teacher know that he is right? Does he hand down a continuous, unbroken tradition from the poet? How does the pupil know that the teacher gives the correct interpretation? In your statement lies the crux of the whole question. Tradition deadens, while investigation gives life. Points once seemingly settled must be reinvestigated by every age, lest the very life of thought die and the human mind shrivel'.

If we seek for side-lights to aid us in finding a solution of our question and turn to the natural sciences for help, everywhere we find minute and painstaking pursuit of knowledge. The scientist of to-day is not content with the theories and explanations of the past; the physician of to-day is not the physician of to-morrow, unless he is content to be left behind in the march of progress. Not only does science seek for a knowledge of facts which may at once be made of practical value to many, but it studies matters whose practical value it would be very difficult to demonstrate to any but the initiated. The young student is at first set at performing experiments which have been performed by thousands of

students before him and will be performed by thousands of students after him. This is done that he may be trained in the use and actions of the materials with which he must work and that the results which he obtains may be checked up by the known results which he ought to obtain. Not till the learner has shown familiarity with and accuracy in the use of his materials is he allowed to go on with the study of minor questions, the answer to which is not already known. When he has shown his ability to cope with minor studies, because of accuracy, application, and the power of marshaling causes and effects in proper sequence, the learner is on the high road to the city of truth.

To return now to the point at issue. The teacher of literature and the philologist have much in common and must work by methods fundamentally the same in point of accuracy and minuteness. The philologist (according to the narrowest definition) makes language itself the subject of his study, but he must bring to his work many aids, philosophy, phonetics, history. When, for example, he applies himself to the task of following the vagaries of a Greek particle through its long life of centuries, he has set himself no mean task. It requires powers of the same order as those required by the teacher of literature. Because he deals with substances invisible to the naked eye is the microscopist narrower than the astronomer who uses a telescope and studies immense suns millions of miles distant from our earth? The teacher of literature must be at least enough of a philologist to use the apparatus which the philologist has prepared for him, while the philologist must be able to understand the author's thought if he would understand the language used to express that thought.

If the partisan of literature says, "What you say is granted, but you are beside the point. Our quarrel is not that the philologist is not a useful animal, but that philologists are in power and wish to make all students philologists like themselves. And when they have had their way they turn out fledglings who, not having their masters' power, but robe themselves in their masters' cloak and hat, and give to minds still more immature mental food of exceeding indigestibility". To which the philologist retorts, "Yes, but you would give to those same immature minds a sense for literature when they have not the mentality to receive it. Those minds must be trained by the study of language before they can understand literature. There are already too many untrained, illogical teachers by word or pen who foist upon an unthinking world 'studies' and 'appreciations' which are nonsense. Who, who, after all the labor you have expended on them, will read the books on the 'five-foot shelf' rather than the 'six best sellers' of the day?"

But wait, friends! Do you not see that each of

you is necessary to the other? and that each must use the other's method, if he wishes to obtain the best results? The whole question is a matter of emphasis, and, as usual, too great attention to one side of the question will obscure the validity of the arguments for the other side. As regards the fact that the newly fledged Ph. D. gives to his immature pupils food which they do not yet need and, therefore, cannot digest, that is merely the fault of youth and inexperience, and will be remedied by the young teacher's growing sense of proportion. Whether he will ever become a great teacher of literature or a great philologist depends on time and temperament. Teach him how to walk and let him do the climbing.

HAMILTON FORD ALLEN.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE.

REVIEWS

A Handbook of Greek Archaeology. By Harold North Fowler and James Rignall Wheeler, with the collaboration of Gorham Phillips Stevens. New York: American Book Company (1909). Pp. 559. \$2.00.

The appearance of this manual, the work of the Editor-in-Chief of the American Journal of Archaeology and the Chairman of the Managing Committee of the American School at Athens, will be welcomed not only by teachers and students of the Classics, but also by the wider circle of those who are interested in Greece and things Greek. All the older English manuals of Greek archaeology, such as Murray's Handbook and Collignon's Manual in the late Professor Wright's excellent translation, have been rendered hopelessly out of date by the rapid progress that has been made since the time of their publication, and the need of a brief and authoritative statement of the principal results of modern research has long been felt. To say that the new Handbook satisfies this need is to emphasize only one merit of the work. In fullness of treatment and of illustration it marks a distinct advance over its predecessors and the arrangement of the matter is clearer and more logical.

The book begins with an Introduction on the study and progress of classical archaeology in modern times and the first chapter is devoted to Prehistoric Greece. After this the treatment is topical: the remaining chapters discuss Architecture, Sculpture, Terracottas, Metal Work, Coins, Engraved Gems, and Painting and Mosaic. A select bibliography and an index complete the book. The chapter on architecture is the work of Mr. Stevens, revised by Professor Fowler, the chapters on vases and painting are by Professor Wheeler, and the other chapters are by Professor Fowler, but "both authors have read the book fully and accept responsibility for the statements contained in it".

The Introduction is one of the most interesting parts of the whole book. In the brief compass of 27 pages it contains an excellent account of the development of archaeological studies in modern times, with helpful hints as to methods and publications. Such an account, so far as I am aware, is not to be found elsewhere in English, though for the most important period, the nineteenth century, Professor Michaelis's *A Century of Archaeological Discoveries* is now available in the translation of Miss Kahnweiler (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.158). To the general reader, however, Professor Michaelis's treatment, concise as it is, is likely to seem too full, and even those who are familiar with that account will find much that is helpful in the briefer statement of the Handbook.

In the chapter on Prehistoric Greece, one naturally looks first to see how the results of recent exploration in the Aegean area have been correlated with the earlier discoveries at Mycenae, Tiryns, and elsewhere. It is gratifying to find that all the important recent excavations have been considered and that a very successful attempt has been made to show the relations of different sites to one another and to trace the development of civilization in Greek lands from neolithic times to the downfall of the Mycenaean culture. Such a comprehensive survey ought to be especially welcome to those whose ideas in regard to the prehistoric culture have been confused by the mass of new material discovered in recent years. Especially commendable features of the chapter are the paragraph on nomenclature, in which the confusing terminology used by recent writers is briefly and clearly explained, and the discussion of the Mycenaean vases. In matters of chronology Professor Fowler is conservative, basing his statements on the system of Egyptian datings proposed by Professor Meyer and adopted by Professor Breasted. So far as possible he avoids the discussion of controverted points and he very wisely makes no attempt to consider the difficult ethnological problem, merely recording his opinion that "it is made very probable by the study of the monuments and the Homeric poems that the Achaean heroes of the Trojan War are identical with the rulers whose wealth, power, and culture are attested by the fortifications, golden treasures, and works of art of the Mycenaean Age".

For the chapter on Architecture the authors were fortunate in securing the collaboration of Mr. Stevens, who was Fellow in Architecture at the School in Athens in 1903-1904 and 1904-1905, and of whose interesting discoveries in connection with the Erechtheum his article in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (1906, pp. 47 ff.) has given us such a tantalizing foretaste. The historical and descriptive parts of this chapter are based largely on Borrmann's *Baukunst des Altertums und des Islam im Mittelalter*, but Mr. Stevens's firsthand knowledge of the monu-

ments is everywhere apparent. This is particularly true of the earlier pages of the chapter, which are devoted to building materials and methods, and of the discussion of the Attic monuments, especially the Erechtheum. One noteworthy feature is the amount of space which is given to civic and private architecture. From most 'handbook' treatments of Greek architecture one carries away the impression that the Greeks built many temples, some theaters, and a few other buildings. Mr. Stevens gives us brief accounts not only temples and theaters, but of many other types—bouleuteria, porticos, gymnasia, stadia, funeral monuments, altars, and private houses. Even the Pharos at Alexandria is briefly discussed. The result is a much more comprehensive picture of the activities of Greek architects than is usually drawn by writers of elementary books. Moreover, in the discussion of these different classes of buildings several examples of each are commonly given so that the reader gains some impression, at least, of the wide variety that exists in Greek buildings of the same type. The attempt which is made to combine a historical treatment with a treatment by types does not seem to me successful. After the account of building materials and methods, we have, as headings of sections, Archaic Architecture (including an account of the Heraeum at Olympia), the Orders, the Doric Order, the Ionic Order, the Corinthian Order, the Temple (including a discussion of treasuries, round buildings, and propylaea), Civic Architecture, Funeral Monuments and Votive Offerings, the Hellenistic Period—an arrangement that seems likely to confuse rather than to help the beginner.

One other chapter which calls for special mention is Professor Wheeler's account of the Vases. This is the longest chapter in the book (114 pages), and to some may seem disproportionate. But the importance of the subject and the difficulties that beset the study of vases would be a sufficient justification for the long chapter, and the length is very largely due to the numerous foot-notes, which here, very wisely, have been introduced more freely than elsewhere. It might be urged, to be sure, that Walter's elaborate *History of Ancient Pottery* now provides the student of Greek vases with a thoroughly trustworthy reference book. But few students (and it may be added, comparatively few libraries) are likely to purchase these expensive volumes, and even those who have access to the larger work will often find it more convenient to refer to Professor Wheeler's clear and altogether excellent account. Particularly admirable are the notes made up of references to a series of vases in which a development described in the text can be traced—for instance, the notes on pp. 508-510, with lists of vases with decoration on a white ground. Nowhere is the up-to-dateness of the book more evident than in this chapter; Furtwängler's identification of the 'Kertch' vases as fourth cen-

tury Attic work is adopted as "almost certainly correct" (p. 504), and the recent finds of 'Cyrenaic' pottery at Sparta are noted (p. 468, note), though Professor Wheeler holds that ampler proof is needed before it can be maintained that Laconia was the original home and the chief center of manufacture of the 'Cyrenaic' vases. The greater part of the chapter is naturally devoted to tracing the different styles of vase-painting, but in the earlier pages a brief account of forms and a very good discussion of technical processes are given.

The remaining chapters contain less that calls for special remark. The chapters on Sculpture and Terracottas follow in the main the lines laid down in earlier handbooks, but always with the same consideration of recent finds and recent discussions that characterizes the rest of the book. The chapter on Metal Work is an interesting attempt to group together bronzes, silverware, and jewelry, in which the bronze statuettes receive, perhaps, a more summary treatment than they deserve, and the whole produces the impression of being somewhat superficial because of the small space at the writer's disposal. The chapter on Coins, on the other hand, is remarkably successful; it gives, in the brief compass of 28 pages, an excellent introduction to what is almost a science in itself. The chapter on Gems, as the preface informs us, is little more than a summary of Furtwängler's *Antike Gemmen*, but it is a very good summary indeed, in which all that is most essential in Furtwängler's monumental work is briefly and clearly set forth. The discussion of Painting and Mosaic has been limited, very wisely, to a few pages, because the extant Greek monuments are so few and unsatisfactory, but the brief description of the secondary sources of information, the notes, and the bibliography give all necessary information for further study of these subjects.

The makeup of the book deserves a word of praise. In spite of its 559 pages, it is printed on a thin paper which reduces the thickness to little more than an inch, a most convenient size. The halftone illustrations, with very few exceptions, are good, and their number shows a praiseworthy liberality on the part of the publishers. In connection with the illustrations several points should be noticed. The practice of recording, *under the illustration*, the source from which it is derived is one that will commend itself to all, especially to those who, like the writer, have wasted hours of precious time in trying to 'run down' an illustration. Then, too, the authors have drawn very largely on collections in this country for illustrative material. Of the 412 illustrations, 54 are taken from objects in American collections. The majority of these, naturally, are terracottas, coins, and vases, but the fact that the development of these branches of Greek art can be so largely illustrated by means of objects in American museums will be a surprise

to many who have not been in touch with the rapid growth of the collections of classical antiquities in this country in recent years. For the study of some phases of Greek art, such as architecture and sculpture, in the original documents, it will always be necessary to visit classic lands and foreign museums, but for the study of the minor arts the museums of this country, especially the Metropolitan Museum in New York and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, already possess original material of the greatest value and importance, and in calling attention to this fact the authors of the new handbook have rendered a very definite service to the cause of classical studies in America.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

GEORGE H. CHASE.

Selected Essays of Seneca and the Satire on the Deification of Claudius. Edited with introduction and notes by Allan P. Ball. New York: The Macmillan Co. (1908). Pp. 211. 60 cents.

A practical edition like Dr. Ball's may aid greatly in an intelligent rehabilitation of Seneca in our college curricula. That the essays and letters have been of late but little read has been due to several causes. Other writers, being better stylists, or more suitable representatives of Latin literature, or proved by experience more serviceable guides for instruction in Roman life and thought, have hitherto elbowed this philosopher into a corner or quite out of the hall. Seneca is not for immature beginners in Latin literature; but on the other hand he should not be ignored by more advanced students, and he can be appreciated by younger minds. Quintilian, although he spoke disdainfully of his style and his apses in taste (10.12 5ff.), frankly admits among his many great merits "a ready and productive mind, very great scholarly devotion and a great fund of information, though in this he was sometimes misled by those to whom he had intrusted the investigation of particular points. He dealt, too, with almost the whole range of scholarly topics . . . In philosophy . . . he was a distinguished assailant of moral faults. In his works there are many noble utterances". But Seneca's literary style, from its very remoteness from Ciceronianism, offers useful material for the study of Silver Latinity, and, what is of some practical importance, for the student who is striving to attain proficiency in reading Latin (as distinguished from translating Latin) is almost a revelation. The sentences are short, generally direct and uninvolved, detached, with connecting particles rapidly approaching the vanishing point. Frequent questions, exclamations, and appeals to the reader give the discourse the freedom of an informal lecture. But especially helpful to one who reads without translating is the insistent repetition of an idea in two or more forms with copious use of simile and metaphor. I know of no

better palaestra for limbering up the vocabulary and strengthening the grip on Latin thought through the phrase-group than is to be found in the nervous, rapid, picturesque style of Seneca. The rhetorical artifices do, indeed, tend to pall; but the modernness and intrinsic value of the thought, when this author is read in moderation in careful selections, greatly lessen any feeling of lassitude.

Dr. Bell has provided adequate material for characterizing Seneca the stylist, the philosopher, the man of letters, and the interpreter of his time. The selections include *Ad Polybium de Consolatione*, the *Apocolocyntosis*, the two books *Ad Neronem de Clementia*, and ten of the *Epistulae Morales*. The general introduction, pp. ix-xxxiv, like the whole book, is modest and unpretentious. After reading it one feels as if he had just shaken hands with Seneca, not made his acquaintance.

As might have been expected from an editor who had already published the *Apocolocyntosis* as a monograph, the notes on that satire are more numerous, ample, learned and also more sparkling than is the case with the more perfunctorily annotated essays. In several places the editor has improved upon the notes in his monograph (e. g. 6.1 *Marci municipem*; 7.1 *ubi mures ferrum rodunt*). Though the notes in the monograph have been much condensed there are still two pages of notes to one of text, while the scale for the rest of the book is less than page for page. Without denying its diverting qualities, one might well feel dubious lest the rollicking 'Pumpkinification' of the late lamented Claudius might blur the outlines of Seneca's more serious literary work in the impression left on the student's mind.

As many readers of the *Ad Polybium de Consolatione* will probably have also read Sulpicius's letter to Cicero on the death of Tullia, and the several consolatory epistles of Pliny, some discussion of the genre would have been welcome (cf. Buresch, *Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque scriptarum historia critica*, *Leipziger Studien* 9). Yet in a work of such brevity some omissions are necessary. The notes seem on the whole uneven, affording ample aid for translation rather than deep insight into the writer's thought and style. Some may cavil at an occasional flippancy met with more often in the class-room than in a school edition—*ma chacun à son gout*. Dr. Ball and the editor of the series deserve only thanks for having provided so well printed and convenient a text of Seneca for our younger college students.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

CORRESPONDENCE

The delightful article by Dr. Riess in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.138-140 suggests certain more or less pertinent questions. It may be true that "nothing will be well done but what is gladly done and our

boys do not love their Latin". Would Dr. Riess be more successful in finding boys who love their mathematics or their science? Few boys display any such interest in the mathematics electives available for them in the upper grades of High School, while the science courses elective in the second and third years are very meagerly attended—a cogent commentary on the confident expectation entertained a few years ago by scientific enthusiasts who predicted the speedy disappearance of the Classics from our schools to make way for physics and chemistry.

Would it not be nearer the truth to say that the average boy does not and cannot be expected to love any task? Smooth ice in winter and a swimming pool in summer look far better to him than a school room. Yet the average boy knows that life cannot be all play and applies himself to his task, perhaps not "gladly" but resignedly. Of course there is a certain type of boy, a little below the average who brings himself into prominence through his noisy protest against his studies. He does not like Latin or any other subject, with whose difficulties he has become acquainted, and he raises such a din in our ears that we forget the uncomplaining majority. Were it possible to secure from the student body of any large classical school an unbiased expression of feeling as to what subject they—perhaps we had better not say love most—dislike least, does Dr. Riess seriously believe that a majority of pupils would prefer mathematics to Classics?

Few of us will be disposed to quarrel with Dr. Riess on one point. Our first year work is certainly a severe strain on the beginner. Little effort is made to make the first year work interesting, or to find any points of contact between what the pupil has learned in the elementary school and what he is set to learn in the High School. The little the boy knows of geography and history might conceivably be utilized in a proper scheme for first year instruction. Professor Sonnenschein's *Ora Maritima* and *Pro Patria* are notable steps in this direction.

There is grave reason to doubt whether pupils could be made to take anything like a lively interest in Roman life at the beginners' stage of mental development. Such a manual as Dr. Riess suggests, modeled on the lines of Gurlitt's *Fibel*, could be adapted to the American boy only with much more difficulty than that requisite to adapt it to the European lad, whose native atmosphere and country's history present many points of contact with Rome.

In view of the fact that Caesar has in spite of the recommendations of the Committee of Ten been adopted with practical unanimity throughout this country as the second year book, are we wise in opposing the tendency to shape our first year work specifically towards a preparation for Caesar? As we are face to face with "a condition and not a theory", may we not more profitably address ourselves to the problem of making the best of the situation by trying to make a Caesar beginning book reasonably interesting?

That little in that direction has been done in current publications is indisputable. Are we on that account to conclude that nothing can be done? Then there is the problem of vocabulary. If we are to read Caesar in the second year, the vocabulary of the first year must be rather rigidly restricted to those words most frequently occurring in the *Commentaries*. How such a vocabulary can be made available to the purpose of a reconstructed Gurlitt's *Fibel* is not clear to my mind.

BOYS HIGH SCHOOL, Brooklyn.

W. A. JENNER.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

The dates of issue of Volume III will be as follows: in 1909, October 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; November 13, 20; December 4, 11, 18; in 1910, January 8, 15, 22, 29; February 5, 12, 19; March 5, 12, 19; April 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; May 7, 14, 21, 28.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

To persons and institutions outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. Single copies or extra copies ten cents each.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

ERST RISS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscription and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

TOWLE AND JENKS'S CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR

Text in clearer print than any other edition.
Notes give exactly the help that pupils need.
Grammatical Appendix contains all the grammar needed for reading Caesar.
Vocabulary is made for pupils of ordinary capacity.

FOUR BOOKS \$1.00 SIX BOOKS \$1.25

D. C. HEATH & CO., PUBLISHERS

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

LEND INTEREST AND VIVIDNESS

To the Teaching of the Classics

Experience of many teachers has shown that original specimens from the times of which they are reading, or illustrative of the narrative, are useful adjuncts in the class-room. Coins are the readiest to understand, easiest and safest to handle, cheapest to acquire. I propose groups to illustrate Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, Livy, Tacitus. Here is a sample.

CAESAR. Price five dollars. (Postage 15c. extra)

A coin made by the Gauls in Caesar's time, and four Roman Silver coins, viz. one with the name of L. Titurius Sabinus, one of Decimus Brutus, and two struck by Caesar himself and referring to the Gallic Wars. Five in all, genuine and fully described. Write to

G. N. OLCOTT,

438 West 116th St.,

New York

HORACE MANN SCHOOL, New York City,

Jan. 27, 1910

"I was not brought up on Harkness's, but on another Latin grammar. When I took up teaching I used Harkness's because it seemed to me the best for the pupil. I used other grammars later, but always returned to Harkness's. If I were to-day to choose a grammar for pupils of academic age, I should select the present Harkness's."

HENRY C. PEARSON

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY - Publishers

BROWN'S MEMORY-TEST LATIN WORD-LIST

(Revised and Enlarged Edition)

An Invaluable Device for Memorizing or Reviewing a Latin Vocabulary. Price, 75 Cents.

Memory Test Note-Book, 15 Cents.

The vocabulary of the complete works of Caesar, Sallust, and Nepos, of Virgil's Aeneid I-VI, and Cicero's Orations is grouped according to frequency of occurrence. The words are arranged so that the English meanings, which are on separate pages not visible at the same time, may, by a simple folding device, be made visible or invisible as desired, parallel with the Latin words. It contains 98% of the vocabulary used at college entrance examinations.

GINN AND COMPANY: PUBLISHERS

70 Fifth Avenue : : New York City

ABBOTT'S SHORT HISTORY OF ROME

An exceedingly interesting narrative, coupled with historical accuracy and balance in the treatment of periods, makes this book most desirable for an elementary course in the subject.

A large number of Maps and Illustrations.

PROF. FRANK FROST ABBOTT

Professor of Classics, Princeton University

A Short History of Rome - - - - - \$1.00
Handbook for Study - - - - - .25

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
EDUCATIONAL PUBLISHERS

CHICAGO

ILLINOIS

CAESAR: THE GALLIC WAR

By A. L. HODGES, Instructor in Latin in Wadleigh High School, New York. 12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. xiii + 522 pages. \$1.25 net.

The fourth book in the Macmillan Latin Series edited by J. C. Kirtland. It includes the seven books of the Commentaries, a comprehensive introduction, helpful notes, and a complete vocabulary.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-68 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

BOSTON CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO

THE STUDENTS' SERIES OF LATIN CLASSICS

IMPORTANT NOTICE—The Johnston-Sanford Caesar (five books) is now furnished with Prose Composition.

PRICE, \$1.25

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.

24 WEST 39TH ST., - - - NEW YORK